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of First Amendment law as laid down in Supreme Court precedents, and (2) Is the discretion lodged in the cemetery superintendent to permit exceptions fall within an acceptable constitutional framework? I conclude that the answer to both questions is in the affirmative and that the bill is well within constitutional limits.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Forte's statement be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have visited the troops in Afghanistan and Iraq several times over the years. While always moving and inspiring experiences, one in particular stands out. It was September where prepra---return to the States. After quite a wait, we were told that they were loading onto the plane the casket of Sergeant Trevor Blumberg, and we would be leaving Baghdad with his body. I have had few honors as great as that one. I am pleased to say that Mrs. Blumberg has since contacted Representative Rogers' office to express her and her husband's support for this bill.

Our Nation's veterans have made the ultimate sacrifice, and it is appalling to see and hear the violence being directed at them. Unfortunately, throughout the country, that is indeed what is happening and it must stop.

I want to thank Mr. Rogers, Chairman Buyer, and Mr. Reyes for all their work in crafting this legislation and their continued dedication to the men and women of our armed forces.

I would also like to recognize Mr. Paul Taylor and Ms. Hilary Funk, staff to the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on the Constitution, for working so closely with my staff and me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.
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I. INTRODUCTION

H.R. 5037, entitled the “Respect for America's Fallen Heroes Act,” seeks to limit “certain demonstrations” in cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration or on the property of Arlington National Cemetery. The bill defines what constitutes a demonstration disruptive of the memorial services or funerals held in or within 500 feet of such cemeteries, but allows an exception for demonstrations on cemetery grounds if “approved by the cemetery superintendent.” There are thus two constitutional issues to be confronted: (1) Does the ban on “certain” demonstrations meet the requirements of First Amendment law as laid down in Supreme Court precedents, and (2) Is the discretion lodged in the cemetery superintendent to permit exceptions fall within an acceptable constitutional framework? I believe that the answer to both questions is in the affirmative and that the bill is well within constitutional limits.

II. THE BAN ON DEMONSTRATIONS

Demonstrations are a form of expressive conduct subject to all governmental restrictions on expressive conduct, Supreme Court jurisprudence requires application of the O'Brien test, United States v. O'Brien, 391 U.S. 367 (1968), Cox v. New Hampshire, 312 U.S. 569 (1941).

The Court has declared that both tests have similar standards. Clark v. Community for Creative Non-Violence, 486 U.S. 288 (1984).

Under the O'Brien test, “a governmental regulation is sufficiently justified if it is designed to serve an important purpose that could not reasonably be achieved in a way that imposes a lesser restraint on the protected interest, and if the regulation is only incidental to the furtherance of that purpose.” United States v. O'Brien, 391 U.S. at 376. Under the “time, place, and manner” test, government regulations of expressive conduct are valid “provided that they are justified without reference to the content of the regulated speech, that they are narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest, and that they leave open alternative channels of communication.” Clark, 488 U.S. at 293.

It is clear from the text of H.R. 5037 that the purpose of the bill is to assure the dignity of funerals or memorial services held in honor of our fallen dead by preventing demonstrations that are disruptive of those ceremonies. To that end, the bill delineates what kind of demonstrations shall be prohibited, viz, a demonstration within five hundred feet of a cemetery in which a funeral or memorial service or ceremony takes place within a time period from 60 minutes before until 60 minutes after the funeral or memorial service. Furthermore, the bill requires that any demonstration that disturbs or tends to disturb the peace or good order of the funeral service or memorial service or ceremony shall be prohibited.

Maintaining cemeteries for veterans is as an important or substantial governmental interest, is clearly within the constitutional power of Congress. Under 38 U.S.C. sect. 2403, the purpose of maintaining cemeteries “as a tribute to our gallant dead” is an important or substantial governmental interest. It is similarly evident from the language of the bill that its purpose is to prevent conduct that is intentionally disruptive of a funeral or memorial service without reference to the content of the expressive conduct. The text does not ban accidental noises present in our modern society near to many cemeteries, such as traffic or the sounds of children playing. “Demonstrations with a particular kind of message. A demonstration connected with a labor dispute that is disruptive of a funeral service or at a war demonstration or a ‘support our troops’ march. Finally, ‘the incidental restriction on First Amendment freedoms is no greater than is essential to the furtherance of that purpose’ of the governmental interests. If, however, a person displays any kind of sign or device he wishes one time, place, and manner and the burden on First Amendment freedoms is no greater than is essential to the furtherance of that purpose.’”Clark, 488 U.S. at 295.

The fact that H.R. 5037 prohibits disruptive demonstrations on grounds that are not part of a national cemetery finds support in Supreme Court precedent. Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104 (1972) is directly on point. In Grayned, the Supreme Court upheld an anti-noise ordinance, which prohibited “any kind of sign or device that tends to disturb the peace or good order of such school session or class thereof.” 408 U.S. at 107-08. It is axiomatic in our legal tradition that reasonable steps to abate a nuisance that would disturb the good order of a federally mandated activity in our national cemeteries, namely, to provide memorial services and ceremonies that are so important to our country.

It should be noted that in Grayned, the Supreme Court held that the anti-noise ordinance did not violate O'Brien because it was not overbroad or vague. H.R. 5037's prohibition on “willfully making or assisting in the making of any noise or diversion that disturbs or tends to disturb the peace or good order of the funeral or memorial service or ceremony” tracks the language approved by the Court in Grayned.

The language of H.R. 5037 finds support in the case of Boos v. Barry, 485 U.S. 312 (1988). In the case, the Supreme Court reviewed a District of Columbia law that prohibited it unlawful to display any sign that brought a foreign government into “public odium” or “public disrepute” within 500 feet of an embassy, and which banned “congregating” within 500 feet of an embassy. The Court struck down the ban on displaying a sign critical of a foreign government, but upheld the ban on congregating if, as construed by the lower courts, the congregation was “directed at a foreign embassy.” H.R. 5037 bans only those demonstrations that are intentionally disruptive of ceremonies or funerals within national cemeteries. The disruptive restriction does not need judicial construction. It is manifestly intended to be the focus of the statute and is fully supported by the decision in Boos v. Barry.

Under H.R. 5037, a person who displays “any placard, banner, flag, or similar device, unless the display is part of a funeral or memorial service or ceremony,” and such a display causes a “disturbance that disturbs or tends to disturb the peace or good order of the funeral service or memorial service or ceremony” shall be prohibited.

Picketing of embassies could still march through the neighborhood to express their opposition to abortion and abortionists. They simply could not disrupt the “quintessence” of a doctor’s home, 484 U.S. at 8, 8. Similarly, in H.R. 5037, the bill seeks to protect the tranquility and dignity of a memorial service. It allows the picker or demonstrator to display whatever kind of sign or device he wishes one hour before or one hour after the ceremony, or at any time if more than 500 feet distant from the cemetery. But there is no restriction on those who may be traveling to the ceremony.

If, however, a person displays “any placard, banner, flag, or similar device, unless the display is part of a funeral or memorial service or ceremony,” and the display occurs within a cemetery, there is no requirement in the bill that it be part of a disturbance of the good order of the ceremony.

Under H.R. 5037, the prohibitions against demonstrations do not take place in a traditional public forum, such as a public sidewalk, but rather within a non-public forum dedicated to the memorial services and ceremonies. The ban is a reasonable, and thereby a valid, restriction in a non-public forum designed to preserve the appropriate functioning of the forum. This analysis is consistent with the law applying to non-public forums in Part III below.
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Thus, under either the O’Brien test or under the time, place and manner test, the statute is drawn to be within Constitutional standards.

Nonetheless, I find one phrase in the bill puzzling. Under section (b)(2), a demonstration is defined as “Any oration, speech, use of sound amplification equipment or device, or similar conduct before an assembled group of people that is not part of a funeral or memorial service or ceremony,” (emphasis added) It would seem that a single individual with a bullhorn who disrupts a ceremony might not be covered under this section. Thus, I do not see the use of the phrase “before an assembled group of people.” In any event, under this phase, the restrictions on expressive conduct is even less than would be permitted to be under the Constitution.

III. THE DISCRETION OF THE CEMETERY SUPERINTENDENT

It is a central canon of our First Amendment jurisprudence that permission to engage in expressive conduct cannot be left to the unbridled discretion of a governmental official. City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co., 486 U.S. 750 (1988). Such a discretion carries with it the dangers of prior restraint, vagueness, overbreadth, and content and viewpoint discrimination. Section 1-(1) of H.R. 5037 prohibits demonstrations in cemeteries under the control of the National Cemetery Administration or in Arlington National Cemetery unless the demonstration has been approved by the cemetery superintendent.” Nonetheless, I do not believe that this section permits unbridled discretion in the cemetery superintendent. Rather, I think that his discretion is well-cabined within and defined by the administrative function the law places upon the cemetery superintendent.

A case directly on point is Griffin v. Secretary of Veterans Affairs, 288 F.3d 1309 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Some veterans were not permitted under federal regulations from placing a Confederate flag at a national cemetery. Placing a flag was interpreted as a forbidden demonstration under 38 C.F.R. sect. 1.218(a)(14). Subsection (1) declares in part, “[A]ny service, ceremony, or demonstration, except as authorized by the head of the facility or designee, is prohibited.” Petitioners asserted that this prohibition gave unconstitutionaldiscretion to the administrator of the facility.

In Griffin, the Federal Circuit Court pointed out that cemeteries are non-public forums the regulations of which are subject only to a reasonable basis test. However, although the government censure the content of expression in non-public forums, it may not engage in viewpoint discrimination. The question was whether the discretion given by the law to the cemetery’s administrator brought with it the danger of viewpoint discrimination. After all, a Confederate flag carries a different viewpoint from the Stars and Stripes.

The Federal Circuit found that the Supreme Court had applied the viewpoint discrimination doctrine only in traditional public forums or in designated public forums. 288 F.3d at 1321. The court zeroed in on the relevant variable in this kind of case: “We are obliged to examine the nature of the forum because, as the Court has recognized, a forum may be reasonable if they are aimed at preserving the property for the purpose to which it is dedicated.” 288 F.3d at 1322. Finding that the Veteran’s Support Campaign support, citing United States v. Kokinda, 497 U.S. 720 (1990), the Federal Circuit upheld the discretion lodged in the cemetery’s administrator.

The purpose of many non-public forums is normative and preserving the function of that forum may entail restricting opposing normative viewpoints. Schools, for example, are non-public forums with developing students’ character for participation as well-informed and well-developed citizens in our system of representative government. To that end, the court noted that students observe rules of respect and avoid hateful or immoral language. A student with an opposite viewpoint who fails to observe the rules of respect was charged with maintaining the cemetery and its activities as “a tribute to our gallant dead.” Under H.R. 5037 he is granted reasonable discretion to assure that all activities within the cemetery accord with its lawfully stated purpose. He may permit ceremonies or demonstrations or signs or programs that accord with such purpose and forbid those that do not. In doing so, the restriction imposed is “reasonable and not an effort to suppress expression merely because public officials disapprove of the expression.” Accordingly, the restriction on disruptive conduct with crude language is not protected by the First Amendment. Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 484 U.S. 260 (1988). Accordingly, the superintendant of a national cemetery is charged with maintaining the cemetery and its activities “as a tribute to our gallant dead.”

IV. CONCLUSION

H.R. 5037 is a well-crafted bill that seeks to maintain the respect earned by our veterans and those who have died for our freedoms and who now rest in national cemeteries. I find that the bill’s careful limitations on disruptive demonstrations and the limited discretion it gives to cemetery superintendents to be well with constitutional limits.

Mr. ANTON, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5037, the Respect for America’s Fallen Heroes Act.

Throughout the history of our country, countless Americans have made the ultimate sacrifice so that we could live freely. We owe these fallen heroes a debt of gratitude, and we should give these families a peaceful journey to their final resting place.

Mr. Speaker, our military cemeteries are hallowed grounds. During the Gettysburg Address, I believe President Abraham Lincoln said it best.

We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who gave here their lives that the nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this place. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

For these reasons, I am greatly troubled that groups exploit the sacrifice of so many Americans. These groups trespass on the memories and hallowed ground of our heroes. Demonstrations at cemeteries disrespect those who have fallen and the loved ones they leave behind. As they held their lines—

I urge the passage of this bill for we must do the same. This bill strikes a proper balance between the liberties they defended and the respect earned.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5037, the Respect for America’s Fallen Heroes Act. This is a much needed piece of legislation to curb the unfortunate actions of a small minority of people. Although I am glad to have this opportunity to support the servicemembers in my home state of Kansas and around the world, I am disappointed that we even have to consider this bill. I have a lot of servicemembers in my district who are courageously serving our country in combat. I have talked to many of them and I have seen their desire and passion to serve their country out of a love for freedom, democracy, and for their countrymen.

Unfortunately, some of these servicemembers have lost their lives and their families must now grieve their loss. The families of our fallen servicemembers—our true heroes—should not be subjected to protests, hate-filled phone calls, and other obscenities. No one should experience that, especially not after losing a loved one. That is why I support this bill that will help protect the families of our fallen servicemembers from unWelcome protestors.

Our servicemembers embody the exact opposite of hate by sacrificing their lives so that we can keep ours. I pay tribute to them, and I wholeheartedly support this legislation.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Respect for America’s Fallen Heros Act.

Like so many of my colleagues, I was horrified that members of Topeka, Kansas, based Westboro Baptist Church were verbally abusing—and interrupting—the funerals of service members who gave the last full measure of devotion to this nation. My constituents and I have been revolting by this offensive activity.

It matters not what your individual position is on either war we are currently prosecuting—in Iraq or Afghanistan—certainly we can all agree protesting at military funerals is a cruel and unnecessary hardship on our military families during their most difficult hour.

I respect the first amendment rights of protesters, and I do not believe this legislation would restrict that right. The restrictions placed in this bill would allow families the privacy to conduct funerals, while still preserving the constitutional right of free speech of our true sponsor.

I ask that all our States pass similar legislation at their State cemeteries, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5037, offered by my colleague from Michigan. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude not only to the fallen soldier, sailor, airman, or Marine, but to their families as well. At their darkest hour, their grief does not need to be exploited by those trying to make a political point. This intentional disruption of a brief period of time meant to honor a fallen hero goes against the very fiber of American decency. Free speech and public protests are a right; however, taunting and tormenting families at the very moment they bury